

REMARKS

In the Office action, claims 8, 28-37 and 39-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; claims 8, 28 and 33-45 were rejected as anticipated by Vogt, claims 8, 28-29 and 33-47 were rejected as being unpatentable over Vogt in view of Kai et al., and claims 30-32 were indicated as being allowable in independent form.

As to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, it is believed that the claims as amended are in proper form. As to claim 8, the objected language has been reworded; as to claim 40 the objected language was deleted, and as to claims 42-43 the claims are canceled, although there is no acquiescence that those rejections were correct. As to the objection that claims 39-47 omitted essential elements, that rejection is generally traversed but is believed to be moot in view of the amended claims. The original claim 39 recited specific structure, not function, in the form of a subassembly. There is no general requirement that all related elements be recited for patentability. Nothing in the specification was identified in the Office action as stating an essential element to the claimed subassembly.

As to the rejections on the merits, claim 8 is amended to recite two chambers each connected to a supply and a delivery line with pinch valves as recited with one of the chambers receiving powder from the supply while the other of the chambers discharges powder to the delivery line. The art of record does not teach or suggest the arrangement as set forth in claim 8. Notably, the Vogt reference does not show chambers that alternately deliver powdered material to a delivery line. As to independent claim 39, that claim has been amended to recite a system that includes a supply, spray gun, feed line, delivery line and a device that conveys material from the supply to the spray gun, with the device having two chambers as recited. The Vogt reference is not directed in any manner to a system as set forth in the amended claims. All the art of record has been taken into consideration in this response, including the JP 9-71325 reference noted in the Office action.

New dependent claims 68-70 are directed to additional novel features and are fully supported at least by the drawings of the original disclosure.

It is believed that the application is in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 21, 2006

By: Leonard L. Lewis
Leonard L. Lewis, Reg. No. 31,176
(216) 622-8683